

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed January 8, 2007.

Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

2. The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, 7-9, 12, 15-18, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hagirahim et al. (US 6,937,598).

The Examiner notes that Hagirahim discloses a method and apparatus for transporting ATM cell traffic over IP networks. In the "Response to Arguments" the Examiner points out that the encapsulation of ATM cells in an IP packet is a kind of format conversion. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to provide that voice packets are received from a first terminal device in a first format and transmitted to a second terminal device in a second format as disclosed in the Specification as filed in paragraph [0016]. Applicant respectfully submits that this clearly distinguishes the claims as amended from the disclosure of Hagirahim because the disclosed method and apparatus must receive and transmit an ATM cell to the terminal devices as there is no conversion of the voice data in the ATM cell nor translation of the associated signaling.

Regarding claims 1, 9, and 17, the claims as amended now provide that voice data is transmitted to a second terminal device in a second format. This distinguishes these claims from the disclosure of Hagirahim in which the terminal devices are always connected to an ATM network (Fig. 5, elements 61). The Examiner asserts that Hagirahim discloses control of the conversion function by a call agent of one of the two networks being interconnected citing col. 5,

lines 29-49, and col. 5, line 59 - col. 6, line 38. Applicant is unable to find anything in the cited portions of Hagirahim that discloses a call agent of a network that controls the conversion of voice packets by an interworking unit.

Regarding claims 4, 12, and 18, the Examiner asserts that Hagirahim discloses interworking unit interfacing with a call agent of a voice packet network, citing col. 5, lines 35-49, and col. 6, lines 29-33. The Examiner argues that the gateway reads on the call agent because the gateway has a conversion (encapsulation) function and paragraph [0013] of the present specification discloses that a call agent has a network management function and has the "conversion server" software for interworking function. The Examiner appears to overlook the disclosure of paragraph [0012] that discloses that internetworking "is accomplished by taking advantage of the call-agent based complex call handling software to interwork the control information native to each of the packet networks." As more fully explained in paragraph [0016], the call agent is associated with one of the two networks being internetworked. The capabilities provided by the call agent of one of the two networks provides a simple method of interworking the two networks. Thus the gateway disclosed by Hagirahim does not read on the call agent as claimed because it is not associated with one of the two networks and it does not provide the complex call handling software that provides a conversion between ATM parameters and IP parameters as disclosed in paragraph [0012] of the present application.

Regarding claims 7, 15, and 21, the amendments of claims 1, 9, and 17 make clear that the IP network transmits voice data to a second terminal device in an IP rather than ATM format. Hagirahim does not disclose transmitting voice data to a terminal device in an IP format.

Regarding claims 8, 16, and 22, Hagirahim does not disclose transmitting voice data to a terminal device in an IP format. The claims have been amended to correct minor editorial problems by deleting "in the voice" and adding --the-- before "internet".

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 4, 7-9, 12, 15-18, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hagirahim.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

4. The Examiner rejects claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagirahim.

Applicant relies on the patentability of the claims from which these claims depend to traverse the rejection without prejudice to any further basis for patentability of these claims based on the additional elements recited. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagirahim in view of Westberg.

New Claims

Applicant presents new claims 37-56, including independent claims 37 and 47. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims contain substantially the same elements as claims 1, 4-9, and 12-22 and are patentable for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.